

**Information Technology Council Meeting
via Conference Call
September 2, 2004**

F i n a l

Present: Tim Lapointe (phone), Quent Boyken (phone), Mary Wegner (by phone), Sandra Glenn (by phone), Betsy Brandsgard (by phone), Kris Junkins (by phone), Christian Gurney (by phone)

Absent: Ron Dardis, Larry Murphy, Greg Stevens, Bill Dotzler, Bob Brunkhorst

Guests: Mollie Anderson, John Gillispie, Linda Plazak, Lorrie Tritch, Diane Van Zante

1. Tim Lapointe, Chair, opened the meeting. Roll call was taken to determine which members were in attendance by phone. It was noted that a quorum of members was present.
2. ROI Projects - Discussion of Ranking Outcomes – On September 1st, a document was forwarded to council members summarizing the FY06 ranking outcomes. Four options were presented for consideration (document attached).



ROI Outcomes
0104.doc (36 KB)

The Chair indicated that he had reviewed the four options and believed that option four, which drops the high and low scores, made the best sense. There was a brief discussion about the ICON and I-PAROLE projects, whether there were interdependencies that required them to be completed in a specific order, the strengths/weaknesses of the two proposals and the justifications provided for each. John Gillispie clarified that ICON is an existing product that has been underway for a number of years. The information that I-PAROLE needs from ICON already exists within ICON.

In reality, how many projects are likely to be funded? Mollie Anderson expressed concern that ranking I/3 as the top project would probably take all of the available funding. There are several good projects and Mollie hopes that the Legislature will appropriate a sizeable amount of money. It is important that the Council look at projects that have system-wide benefit. In FY02, no money was allocated and ITE was asked to use carryover money from the prior year. In FY03, approximately \$2 million was available for Pooled Technology, in FY04 \$1.8 million. John Gillispie hopes that the SEAMLESS project will request funding from the IOWAccess Advisory Council. Mollie emphasized the importance of having a group of advisors finalize a recommendation rather than having the Director drive the process on a project that seems to benefit his/her own department. Mollie and John have tried to step back and let the Council drive the process. Several members expressed concern about the HIPAA Security project and felt the specifics of the proposal were weak.

3. Finalize Recommendation to DAS Director – Quent Boyken moved that the Council support option four, which utilizes more of a consensus type approach. Betsy Brandsgard seconded the motion. Diane Van Zante reported that while General Dardis was unable to participate in the conference call, he left word that he views two projects as very important: Electronic Tax Administration and HIPAA Security. In option four, the top four projects are, in order: I/3, Electronic Tax Administration, Data Warehouse, and I-PAROLE. The Council would be recommending the submission of all nine projects, in the order shown in option four.

How does the process work? Once legislative action has been taken, the total amount of money has been determined, and any specific projects have been mandated, DAS contacts each of the sponsors and asks them to identify the minimum amount of money needed for the project. Sometimes, things change over the course of time and DAS allocates the remaining money based upon updated figures. Remaining money, if any, is generally carried forward into the next year.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion, with results as indicated:

Tim Lapointe - Aye
Quent Boyken - Aye
Mary Wegner - Aye
Sandra Glenn - Aye
Betsy Brandsgard - Aye
Kris Junkins - Aye
Christian Gurney - Aye

The motion to recommend option four passed unanimously.

4. Wrap-up and Adjourn – The next IT Council meeting is scheduled for November 18 at 1:30 p.m. at the Hoover Building on Level B. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:47 a.m.